

**Evaluation Design Report  
(updated)**

**MCA-N Contract: MCA/COM/RCQ/5E01001**

**Evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Support Activity**

**06 February 2013**



---

**Commissioned by the Millennium Challenge Account Namibia  
with funding from the Millennium Challenge Corporation**



## **Preface/acknowledgements**

First of all I would like to thank MCA-N for entrusting me with the interesting and challenging task of evaluating MCA Namibia's Livestock Support Activity. I look forward to a sustained positive cooperation in the coming years.

Secondly I would like to thank MCA-N staff and representatives of the LMEF grantees for the assistance provided during my first missions to Namibia and preparation of the evaluation design.

Finally I would like to point out that, although I am employed by Consultants for Development Programmes (CDP) in the Netherlands, I was selected and contracted by MCA-N in a personal capacity and the opinions in this report are my own, and not necessarily those of CDP or MCA-N.

Paul Sijssens

Consultants for Development Programmes  
Achter Clarenburg 25  
3511 JH Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
[www.cdp-online.nl](http://www.cdp-online.nl)

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Preface/acknowledgements.....   | i  |
| List of acronyms.....   | iv |
| Executive summary .....   | vi |
| 1. Introduction .....   | 1  |
| 1.1 Objective of the evaluation design and planning.....  | 1  |
| 1.2 Process of the evaluation design and planning.....  | 1  |
| 2. Summary information on the Activity .....  | 2  |
| 2.1 MCA-N livestock support sub-activities.....   | 2  |
| 2.2 LMEF Grant 2010/01: Unleashing the potential of livestock sector in Oshana and Ohangwena Regions .....  | 3  |
| 2.3 LMEF Grant 2010/02: Development of export opportunities for beef products from the Caprivi Region .....   | 3  |
| 2.4 LMEF Grant 2010/03: Sero-epidemiological and Parasite Survey in the Northern Communal Areas in Namibia .....  | 4  |
| 2.5 Grant 2010/04: Baseline Survey of Animal Nutrition in the Northern Communal Areas of Namibia .....  | 4  |
| 2.6 LMEF Grant 2012/01: Developing the livestock sector and income to livestock producers in the San conservancies of Tsumkwe Constituency .....                      | 4  |
| 2.7 LMEF Grant 2012/02: Development of strategies, road map and plan of action and preparation of supporting documents to declare the NCAs free of FMD and CBPP ..... | 5  |
| 2.8 LMEF Grant 2012/03: Creation of fire breaks around and inside Kopano and Katima quarantine farms .....  | 5  |
| 2.9 Construction of five State Veterinary Offices (SVOs) .....  | 6  |
| 2.10 Rehabilitation of two quarantine camps.....  | 6  |
| 2.11 Development of a livestock traceability system in the NCAs .....   | 6  |
| 3. Evaluation methodology and approach .....  | 7  |
| 3.1 Objectives of the evaluation.....   | 7  |
| 3.2 Characteristics of Real Time Evaluation .....   | 7  |
| 3.3 Main criteria for evaluation.....   | 8  |
| 3.4 Research questions, data requirements and sources of information .....  | 8  |
| 3.5 Tools for data collection .....   | 11 |
| 3.6 Risk assessment for evaluation .....  | 11 |
| 4 Evaluation work plan .....  | 13 |
| 4.1 Quarterly evaluation missions.....  | 13 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 4.2 Final evaluation of grant cycles .....        | 14 |
| 4.3 Final comprehensive evaluation.....           | 14 |
| Annex 1 Terms of Reference, with amendments ..... | 16 |

## List of acronyms

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| AGRA-PSD | AGRA Professional Services Division                   |
| CBPP     | Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia                     |
| CBRLM    | Community Based Rangeland and Livestock Management    |
| CBT      | Commodity-Based Trade                                 |
| CDP      | Consultants for Development Programmes                |
| CPP      | Namibia Country Pilot Partnership                     |
| CVL      | Central Veterinary Laboratory                         |
| CSA      | Consulting Services Africa                            |
| DAC      | Development Assistance Committee                      |
| DEES     | Directorate of Engineering and Extension Services     |
| DVS      | Directorate of Veterinary Services                    |
| FGD      | Focus Group Discussions                               |
| FMD      | Foot and Mouth Disease                                |
| HACCP    | Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point                |
| KII      | Key Informant Interview                               |
| LMEF     | Livestock Market Efficiency Fund                      |
| LPF      | Livestock Producer Forum                              |
| MAWF     | Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry           |
| MBN      | Meat Board of Namibia                                 |
| MCA-N    | Millennium Challenge Account Namibia                  |
| MCC      | Millennium Challenge Corporation                      |
| MEATCO   | Meat Corporation of Namibia                           |
| MPR      | Monthly Progress Report                               |
| NCA      | Northern Communal Areas                               |
| NNDFN    | Nyae Nyae Development Foundation Namibia              |
| OECD     | Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development |
| OIE      | World Organisation for Animal Health                  |
| QPR      | Quarterly Progress Report                             |
| RIA      | Rangeland Intervention Area                           |
| RTE      | Real Time Evaluation                                  |

|     |                         |
|-----|-------------------------|
| SVO | State Veterinary Office |
| ToR | Terms of Reference      |

## **Executive summary**

This report presents the updated design for the evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Support Activity.

The original evaluation design and planning took place from Monday 6 February to Friday 2 March 2012 in response to the Terms of Reference issued by Millennium Challenge Account Namibia (MCA-N). At that time the evaluation concerned the Livestock Market Efficiency Fund (LMEF) only. The design mission consisted of document review, familiarisation field visits and the actual design of the evaluation.

In September 2012 the Scope of Services was amended by including three additional MCA-N livestock support sub-activities: the construction of five State Veterinary Offices (SVOs), rehabilitation of two quarantine camps and the livestock traceability system. The amendment of the Scope of Services calls for an update of the evaluation design. Firstly, the name of the assignment changes from "Evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Market Efficiency Fund" to "Evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Support Activity". Secondly, the addition of the three sub-activities comes with new, specific, evaluation questions. And thirdly, after one year of evaluation there may be new insights that may require adjustments of research questions, especially in terms of the synergies between all the sub-activities under the Livestock Support activity.

The objective of the evaluation is "to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the MCA-N Livestock Support Activity". The ToR indicates that the evaluation is to take place while the sub-activities are being implemented and that it must consist of a series of evaluation missions, observing the sub-activities as they are being implemented in the field. Although not explicitly called as such in the ToR, it means that de facto the assignment will have to take the form of a Real Time Evaluation (RTE).

The evaluation methodology will follow the assessment of the five main criteria defined by the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC): relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. For each of these criteria, research questions were defined. Some of these questions were taken from the ToR and contract amendment, others were added to allow sufficient analysis of the evaluation criteria. Subsequently, data requirements and sources of information were indicated.

Tools for data collection were defined and a provisional work plan was drawn up. It contains three main elements: (i) quarterly evaluation missions, (ii) the final evaluation of the grant cycles and (iii) the final comprehensive evaluation of the MCA-N livestock support activity.

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Objective of the evaluation design and planning**

Originally a design was made for the evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Market Efficiency Fund (LMEF). According to the Terms of Reference (ToR), the first phase consisted of evaluation design and planning. The consultant was to "review the LMEF Grant Manual and all relevant grant documents and available literature and data to determine the methodology needed to carry out the evaluation, including any additional data needs aside from that which can be gathered from grantees and which can be obtained through Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and prepare a full evaluation design report". In September 2012 the Scope of Services was amended by including three new MCA-N Livestock Support Activity's sub-activities, which called for an update of the evaluation design. The amended ToR for the evaluation is attached as Annex 1.

### **1.2 Process of the evaluation design and planning**

The original evaluation design and planning was done during the consultant's first mission to MCA-N in the context of the LMEF evaluation, which took place from Monday 6 February to Friday 2 March 2012.

After a briefing meeting with MCA-N staff and representatives of the four LMEF 1<sup>st</sup> cycle grantees, and review of documentation, field visits to the Northern Communal Areas (NCAs) took place. At the end of the mission a debriefing meeting was held at the MCA-N office in Windhoek on Friday 2 March.

Since the approval of the evaluation design report, three quarterly evaluation missions have taken place. In the meantime three new LMEF grants have been approved and added to the evaluation scope. Moreover, in September 2012 the Scope of Services was amended by including three additional MCA-N livestock sub-activities: the construction of five State Veterinary Offices (SVOs), rehabilitation of two quarantine camps and the livestock traceability system. In response to these developments the evaluation design and planning was updated in January 2013.



## **2. Summary information on the Activity**

In this section short descriptions of the Livestock Support Activity and its sub-activities are given.

### **2.1 MCA-N livestock support sub-activities**

The overall aim of MCA-N's Agriculture Project is to reduce rural poverty through investments that achieve a sustainable increase in the economic performance of the agricultural sector. It comprises three main activities: (i) livestock support, (ii) land access and management, and (iii) indigenous natural products. The livestock support activity seeks to bring the marketing opportunities for farmers who live north of the Veterinary Cordon Fence closer to the opportunities enjoyed by farmers south of the Fence.

The Livestock Support Activity, subject to this evaluation, consists of the following sub-activities:

- The Livestock Market Efficiency Fund (LMEF). The LMEF supports demand-driven actions aimed at improving the performance of the livestock sector in the NCAs. The objective of the LMEF is to increase incomes to livestock producers and ensure the continued growth of the livestock sector. It is expected that this objective will be achieved through improving livestock marketing, eliminating barriers to existing and new markets and improving the marketability of livestock for broad application to the livestock industry in the NCAs to ensure the competitiveness and sustainability of the livestock sector.
- The construction of five State Veterinary Offices (SVOs). Three new SVOs are constructed in high volume livestock areas (Eenhana, Outapi and Omuthiya), which were identified as optimal geographic sites for veterinary offices and clinics through the Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry's (MAWF). These offices are intended to improve the delivery of veterinary services to the NCAs which have been historically underserved. An additional two SVOs are constructed at two underserved sites south of the existing Veterinary Cordon Fence, Okakarara and Epukiro, to support improved livestock production in those areas.
- Rehabilitation of two quarantine camps. Because of the continued presence of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in Caprivi, the two quarantine camps that provide throughput to the only operating meat processing plant located in the region are rehabilitated to improve livestock productivity and marketing.
- Support to the livestock traceability system. The main aim of the traceability system is to provide livestock owners and the government with timely and quality information on livestock numbers, their location, animal health status and other key attributes associated with livestock. This information will enable excellent response to disease outbreaks and is hoped to result in achieving disease-free status in the Northern Communal Areas, and eventually to provide farmers in these areas access to high-value markets for their meat products. Support for the procurement of necessary equipment and software to launch an animal traceability system for livestock in the NCAs has been provided. The installation of software supports the collection of livestock data from livestock tags at points of veterinary inspections, vaccination, and sales to ensure that livestock data is maintained in a functional system and updated on a regular basis. The new traceability system,

currently in use in the Northern Communal Areas, is scheduled to be extended to service the entire country as early as June 2013.

## **2.2 LMEF Grant 2010/01: Unleashing the potential of livestock sector in Oshana and Ohangwena Regions**

The grant project originally aimed to create 12 case study NCA village communities in Ohangwena and Oshana Regions which show how NCA farmers can increase the income that they earn from their livestock by adopting improved management of their livestock and so improving the quality at point of sale. This is expected to be accomplished by delivering training on, and support to establish, improved livestock farming practices, infrastructure management and other key actions. A network of expertise will be established in these communities through community mobilisers, who will offer encouragement and support in their own communities as well as being able to offer their expertise to other livestock farmers. This grant project is expected to then be promoted to encourage other communal livestock farmers to follow their example.

The grant project is implemented by Komeho Namibia Development Agency and has a duration from 1 April 2011 until 30 April 2013.

After it was observed that attendance turned out to be quite low, resulting in a limited outreach of the grant project, Komeho agreed to add more villages to the training programme. Surrounding villages of each of the originally selected four villages will be invited to attend, clustered with the second batch of four villages.

## **2.3 LMEF Grant 2010/02: Development of export opportunities for beef products from the Caprivi Region**

For Caprivi region, where Foot and Mouth Diseases (FMD) eradication is not realistic, an alternative approach is needed in order not to exclude cattle farmers from future market access. The approach which will be tested and evaluated in this project is an integration of the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) approach and the Commodity-Based Trade (CBT) concept to achieve effective food safety and animal disease risk management. In order to address not only the safety but also the quality of the product, the project will involve cattle producers who commit to improved animal management practices and the delivery of quality animals to a local export abattoir.

Phase 1 of the project is mainly consisting of theoretical research work which needs to be done to develop detailed value chain descriptions, market analysis and protocols relating to HACCP procedures, production protocols, etc. Another component is the FMD virus testing done in an internationally accredited FMD laboratory.

The 50 farmers who are being mentored own a total of 6,000 – 7,000 cattle and are distributed throughout all the constituencies of Caprivi. The project aims to eventually influence 12,000 households with 156,000 cattle across the entire NCAs.

The project is implemented by Meat Board of Namibia and originally had a duration from 15 March 2011 until 31 December 2011 (phase 1). The project timeframe has in the meantime been extended.

#### **2.4 LMEF Grant 2010/03: Sero-epidemiological and Parasite Survey in the Northern Communal Areas in Namibia**

The grant project concerns the collection of baseline epidemiological data and the development of investigation protocols and standard operating procedures for DVS staff for the investigation and diagnosis of abortion problems in goats and infectious fertility problems in cattle. These can then be utilised at a later stage to control infectious diseases and parasite infection which will lead to improved fertility and production, which in turn should lead to increased income and reduced overstocking and rangeland degradation, since smaller numbers of livestock can be kept.

The data will be made available to the Directorate of Veterinary Services (DVS) for the development and implementation of control and eradication programmes for specific infectious diseases and to advise farmers on the appropriate use of anthelmintics (internal parasite remedies), as well as develop and implement human hygiene programmes in co-operation with the relevant health authorities (toilets and regular de-worming) to eliminate human tapeworm infestation and concurrent bovine and porcine cysticercosis. The research data will automatically become part of the epidemiological database of DVS. The project is implemented by AGRA-PSD and has a duration from 1 May 2011 until 30 April 2013.

#### **2.5 Grant 2010/04: Baseline Survey of Animal Nutrition in the Northern Communal Areas of Namibia**

The grant project attempts to identify and alleviate nutritional problems of livestock animals free-ranging in the NCAs of Namibia. It will supplement the Community-Based Rangeland and Livestock Management Project of MCA-N, which attempts to increase the quantity of grazing on offer by improved grazing management. Namibian experience has shown that once the quantity of grazing is satisfactory, the quality thereof (i.e., the nutritional value of the grassland) becomes the next factor limiting animal production. Thus, the baseline survey samples soil, drinking water, forage plants and livestock animals directly to determine their nutrient status and identify nutritional deficiencies, excesses and other problems (Objective 1). These will then be addressed in a lick supplementation pilot trial (Objective 2), before the message will be passed on to the primary producer in the NCA in an extensive outreach effort (Objective 3). The project is implemented by AGRA and has a duration from 1 April 2011 until 30 April 2014.

#### **2.6 LMEF Grant 2012/01: Developing the livestock sector and income to livestock producers in the San conservancies of Tsumkwe Constituency**

The overall objective of the grant project is to reduce poverty amongst the San of Nyae Nyae and NꞤa Jaqna Conservancies through the development of capacity and sustainable livelihoods. This is expected to be achieved through the development of the livestock management capacity in the community and through developing a greater understanding of the livestock marketing chain.

The livestock management capacity of the San is targeted for development through training, pilots site projects, exposure visits and motivating planned grazing by herding, and is expected to lead to bigger, better maintained herds, no over-grazing and no negative impact to wildlife numbers and reduced human-wildlife conflict.

The goal is that understanding of the local, regional and national market chain and how best these conservancies can improve income to their members will be developed through training,

communication and providing mechanisms to access better markets, including traceability, thereby leading to improved income from sales of livestock.

The project is implemented by the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDNFN) and started mid April 2012. It will run for two years in a total of six pilot sites in Nyae Nyae Conservancy (2 already exist) and 2-3 pilot sites in NꞤa Jaqna Conservancy.

## **2.7 LMEF Grant 2012/02: Development of strategies, road map and plan of action and preparation of supporting documents to declare the NCAs free of FMD and CBPP**

The main objective of the grant project is to lay the groundwork for the implementation of the “Policy for the Eradication of Trans-boundary Animal Diseases in the Northern Communal Areas of Namibia” by investigating and providing DVS with detailed strategies, road map and implementation plans. A second objective is to build DVS’ technical capacity to be able to implement the detailed strategies, road map and plans effectively and efficiently.

More specifically the project aims the local eradication of FMD and CBPP. The project consists of five phases (called objectives in the project proposal):

- Assessing the current status of the NCA with regards to the OIE pathway for FMD and CBPP freedom and identifying the criteria remaining to be met;
- Investigating and documenting the strategic choices and pathways available for FMD and CBPP freedom in consultation with local and international stakeholders (including Angola) and creation of consensus;
- Strategy or strategies with implementation plans to achieve FMD and CBPP freedom are written and acceded to by Angola and OIE;
- Develop and implement of a communication strategy and plan to disseminate information on the selected disease eradication strategies and implementation plans thereby creating awareness in the affected communities;
- Develop capacity and effective tools for disease management in the NCA.

The project management will be executed by consultants under supervision of a Project Coordinator supported by a Steering Committee and Technical Committee.

## **2.8 LMEF Grant 2012/03: Creation of fire breaks around and inside Kopano and Katima quarantine farms**

The aim of this action is to promote fire security at quarantine farms thereby ensuring uninterrupted marketing of cattle through the quarantine system. The creation and maintenance of fire breaks around and inside the quarantine farms should prevent spread of fires emanating from outside or inside. Graders will be used to create fire breaks around the perimeter while the inside corridors will be cleared by local communities.

The project consists of five activities (called objectives in the project proposal):

- To create 10 meter wide fire breaks around the perimeter fences;
- To create fire breaks in the 10 metre corridors;

- To train communities in fire prevention and management;
- To train farmers in disease recognition and condition scoring;
- To pilot grass/ legume production in both quarantine farms.

The project is implemented by DEES, DoF and Namibian Agronomic Board (NAB). The Project Coordinator will implement the project under the guidance of the State Veterinarian, Katima Mulilo. His team shall constitute a project management committee.

## **2.9 Construction of five State Veterinary Offices (SVOs)**

Three new SVOs are constructed in high volume livestock areas (Eenhana, Outapi and Omuthiya), which were identified as optimal geographic sites for veterinary offices and clinics through the Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry's (MAWF) National Agricultural Support Services Program study during 2006. These offices are intended to improve the delivery of veterinary services to the NCAs which have been historically underserved. An additional two SVOs are constructed at two underserved sites south of the existing Veterinary Cordon Fence, Okakarara and Epukiro to support improved livestock production in those areas.

State Veterinary Offices (SVOs) are constructed in the following five locations:

- Omuthiya, in Oshikoto Region, North of the veterinary fence
- Eenhana, in Ohangwena Region, North of the veterinary fence
- Outapi, in Omusati Region, North of the veterinary fence
- Okakarara, in Otjozondjupa Region, South of the veterinary fence
- Epukiro, in Omaheke Region, South of the veterinary fence

## **2.10 Rehabilitation of two quarantine camps**

Because of the continued presence of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in Caprivi, the two quarantine camps (Katima Mulilo and Kopana) that provide throughput to the only operating meat processing plant located in the region are rehabilitated to improve livestock productivity and marketing.

## **2.11 Development of a livestock traceability system in the NCAs**

The Namibia Compact funds the development of a livestock traceability system, which did not previously exist in the NCAs. The main aim of the traceability system is to provide livestock owners and the government with timely and quality information on livestock numbers, their location, animal health status and other key attributes associated with livestock. The system initiates documentation of health status, reproductive history and movement of all livestock in the NCAs and meet market-entry and traceability requirements of livestock and livestock products throughout the entire supply chain. Support for the procurement of necessary equipment and software to launch an animal traceability system for livestock in the NCAs has been provided. The installation of software supports the collection of livestock data from livestock tags at points of veterinary inspections, vaccination, and sales to ensure that livestock data is maintained in a functional system and updated on a regular basis. The new traceability system, currently in use in the NCAs, is scheduled to be

extended to service the entire country as early as June 2013, thus replacing the existing traceability system south of the veterinary fence.

### **3. Evaluation methodology and approach**

#### **3.1 Objectives of the evaluation**

The objective of the evaluation is “to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the MCA-N livestock support activity”.

The evaluation should also look at the impact of MCA-N livestock support sub-activities in terms of:

- reducing costs and losses associated with marketing livestock in the NCAs;
- alleviating other challenges to successful commercial marketing of livestock that are present in the current supply chain beyond the farm gate due to the lack of disease free status; and
- identifying and eliminating barriers to increasing volume of livestock and livestock products sold into existing markets and accessing additional markets destinations.

The evaluation of the MCA-N’s individual livestock sub-activities cannot be understood in isolation but rather only within the broader context of the livestock sector and MCA Namibia’s Livestock Support Activity as a whole. The evaluation should therefore include an assessment of the synergies between the different MCA-N livestock sub-activities.

The ToR indicates that the evaluation is to take place while the activity is being implemented and that it must consist of a series of evaluation missions, observing the sub-activities as they are developing in the field. Although not explicitly called as such in the ToR, it means that de facto the assignment will have to take the form of a Real Time Evaluation (RTE).

#### **3.2 Characteristics of Real Time Evaluation**

The easiest definition of RTE is an evaluation that is carried out while the intervention is in full implementation and feeds back its findings to the implementers for immediate use”.

A RTE, with its recurrent field missions and regular feedback to the implementation managers, has the following characteristics, which have to be considered for the design of the evaluation:

- RTE refers to a series of iterative evaluations;
- RTE is interactive: the evaluator discusses findings with the implementers and takes account of their views in the evaluation reports;
- RTE can be used to check compliance with broader issues such as relevant donor and government policies;
- RTE brings in an external perspective, analytical capacity and knowledge. The evaluator acts as the ‘stranger who sees more’ because of his distance from day-to-day activities.

RTE is different from monitoring as it asks not only if implementation is according to plans, but also whether the plans are appropriate and in line with donor and/or national policies.

### 3.3 Main criteria for evaluation

In the consultant's approved technical and financial proposal for the evaluation of MCA-N Livestock Support Activity, it was proposed to include in the evaluation methodology the assessment of the five main criteria defined by the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC): relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The criteria are defined as follows:

Relevance: the extent to which the intervention is suited to the priorities and policies of the donor, the appropriateness of the intervention to the problems, needs and priorities of its target groups/beneficiaries, and the quality of the design through which the objectives are to be reached.

Efficiency: this measures the outputs, qualitative and quantitative, in relation to the inputs.

Effectiveness: the contribution made by the intervention's results/outcomes to the achievement of the activity's purpose.

Impact: the effect of the intervention on its wider environment (change). This involves effects resulting from the intervention on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. Note that these effects can be both intended and unintended, as well as positive and negative.

Sustainability: the likelihood of a continuation of benefits produced by the intervention after the period of external support has ended.

For each of these criteria specific questions can be defined, for each of the MCA-N Livestock Support Activity sub-activities. These questions are elaborated in the next section.

### 3.4 Research questions, data requirements and sources of information

Research questions are compiled from three sources: (i) the Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the LMEF (which in turn come from M&E Plan for the MCA-N Compact), (ii) the amendment of the evaluation's Scope of Services of September 2012, (iii) the M&E plans of the different grant projects, and (iv) from the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria given above.

In the following table, research questions are defined for each evaluation criterion. For each research question the respective data requirements and sources of information are given.

**Table 3.1** Research questions, data requirements and sources of information for MCA-N Livestock Support Activity

| Research questions   | Information needed   | Source of information  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><u>Relevance</u></p> <p>Are the Activity objectives consistent with, and supportive, of the MCA-N objectives? Are the Activity and its sub-activities consistent with the national goals or objectives of government and MAWF?</p> <p>Does the Activity respond to the needs of the target groups?</p> <p>What is the program logic, i.e., the full chain of results from inputs, outputs and outcomes<sup>1</sup> for of the Livestock Support Activity? Is the intervention's logic clear and logical (e.g., how the components fit together; do they all contribute to a common set of outcomes; do activities or service gaps need to be filled in order to generate expected impacts)?</p> <p>What are the risks and assumptions; are they holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?</p> <p>How were key stakeholders involved in the design process?</p> | <p>Analysis of Activity objectives</p> <p>Problem analysis<br/>Activity design</p> <p>Activity design</p> <p>Risk analysis<br/>Project design</p> <p>Activity design process</p> | <p>Project proposal<br/>MCA-N compact<br/>LMEF Grant Manual</p> <p>Project proposal<br/>Progress reports<br/>Observations and interviews<br/>Project proposal</p> <p>Project proposal<br/>Progress reports<br/>Observations and interviews<br/>Project proposal<br/>Stakeholder interviews<br/>MAWF Strategic Plan<br/>Vision 2030 or NDP3 or 4?</p> |
| <p><u>Efficiency</u></p> <p>Are activities implemented as scheduled? If there are delays how can they be rectified? Are a work plan and resource schedule available and used by the project management?</p> <p>Are all contractual procedures clearly understood and do they facilitate the implementation of the projects?<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Are inputs provided/available at planned cost (or lower than planned)?</p> <p>How well are activities monitored by the project and are corrective measures taken if required?</p>   | <p>Work plan<br/>Implementation reports</p> <p>LMEF design<br/>Grant contracts<br/>Implementation report<br/>Project financial data</p> <p>M&amp;E plan<br/>M&amp;E reports</p>  | <p>Progress reports<br/>Project staff interviews<br/>Observations</p> <p>Progress reports<br/>Observations and interviews</p> <p>Progress reports<br/>MCA-N finance officer<br/>Project proposal<br/>Progress reports<br/>Observations and interviews</p>  |
| <p><u>Effectiveness</u></p> <p>Have the planned results to date been achieved? What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? What is the quality of outputs?</p> <p>What is the likelihood of the project objectives to be achieved?</p> <p>Does the LMEF contribute to disease free status for the NCAs? If so, how and to what extent?<sup>2</sup></p>  | <p>Implementation reports<br/>M&amp;E reports</p> <p>Project design<br/>Implementation reports<br/>M&amp;E reports<br/>LMEF design<br/>Implementation report</p>                 | <p>Progress reports<br/>Observations and interviews</p> <p>Observations and interviews<br/>Surveys<br/>Progress reports<br/>Observations and interviews</p> <p>LMEF grant manual<br/>Grant projects<br/>Progress reports</p>   |

<sup>1</sup> The evaluation report will include a diagram of the program logic along with an explicit discussion of the evaluator's assessment thereof

<sup>2</sup> Specific question for LMEF as a whole



| Research questions   | Information needed   | Source of information  |
|--|--|--|
| To what extent, if any, has the Namibia Compact achieved stated objectives related to quarantine camp, SVO, and livestock traceability investments? <sup>3</sup>   | Project design<br>Implementation reports<br>M&E reports  | Observations and interviews<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews   |
| <b>Impact</b><br>What has happened as a result of the project or what is likely to happen?<br><br>What real difference has the project made to the beneficiaries?<br>How many people have been affected?<br><br>Are any external factors likely to jeopardise the project's direct impact?<br>To what extent does the LMEF contribute to measures of livelihood among beneficiaries? <sup>2</sup><br><br>Does the LMEF contribute towards the identification and elimination of existing marketing barriers and other challenges to successful commercial marketing of livestock in the NCAs? If so, what is the potential impact (e.g., increased volume of livestock and livestock products sold into existing markets in the NCAs and in existing and new market destinations)? <sup>2</sup><br>What is the potential impact of SVO and quarantine camp construction, and cattle tagging on: <sup>3</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cattle health?</li> <li>• Attainment of FMD-free status?</li> <li>• Cattle marketability?</li> <li>• International market access?</li> <li>• Livestock sales?</li> </ul> How have different MCA-N livestock sub-components reinforced (potential) impact of individual sub-components? | Implementation reports<br>M&E reports<br><br>M&E reports<br><br>Implementation reports<br>M&E reports<br>Implementation reports<br>M&E reports<br><br>Implementation reports<br>M&E reports<br><br>Implementation reports<br>M&E reports | Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br><br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys<br><br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys<br><br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys |
| <b>Sustainability</b><br>Are the services/results affordable for the target groups at the completion of project?<br>How far is the project embedded in local structures?<br><br>To what extent are relevant target groups actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?<br>How have different MCA-N livestock sub-components reinforced sustainability of individual sub-components<br>What support has been provided by the relevant national or local government?<br><br>Has the application of the LMEF led to any multiplier   | Project design<br><br>Project design<br><br>Implementation reports<br>M&E reports<br>Project design<br><br>Implementation  | Stakeholder interviews<br><br>Project proposal<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Project proposal<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Surveys<br>Project proposal<br>Progress reports<br>Observations and interviews<br>Progress reports  |

<sup>3</sup> Specific question for projects added to the Scope of Services.

| Research questions   | Information needed     | Source of information       |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| effects in terms of replication of grantee projects, extension of project outcomes, and dissemination of information? <sup>2</sup> | reports<br>M&E reports | Observations and interviews |

### 3.5 Tools for data collection

#### Document review

Official project documents, and especially Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), are a primary source of information for the evaluation. The QPRs provide information on progress of implementation, adherence to or deviation from the work plan, risk analysis, and M&E information.

#### Field observations and beneficiary consultation

Observation plays a particularly important role in RTE. The evaluator may gather information directly from observation that would not be available indirectly through key informants. Observation is also a good means of triangulating findings from progress reports.

During field work the consultant will meet with Activity beneficiaries and get their views. It is essential that the consultant engages in beneficiary consultation, as this is an important added value of RTE. Consultation can take various forms: key informant interviews, general meetings or focus group interviews.

#### Key informant interviews

While real-time evaluations should make extensive use of observation, key informant interviews (KIIs) are likely to be an important additional source of information. Most key informant interviews will take the form of semi-structured interviews.

The recurrent field missions of RTE offer the opportunity to interview people more than once, to capture any learning that takes place as the Activity is progressing.

#### Focus group discussions

Focus groups can provide the evaluator with qualitative information on a range of issues. Ideally it involves five to twelve people in a discussion of their experiences and opinions about a topic.

#### Surveys

Surveys are generally not practicable as part of real-time evaluations as they take too long to prepare, conduct and process. However, it is expected that it will be possible to make use of surveys by MCA-N and project implementers, which are done as part of regular monitoring.

### 3.6 Risk assessment for evaluation

A risk emerging from the original ToR for LMEF evaluation was the original emphasis on the impact on the intended beneficiaries, mainly in terms of income or other quantifiable benefits. A first preliminary assessment of the four approved and ongoing grant projects indicated that it will be quite difficult, if not impossible, to measure the impact of these projects. The two projects implemented by AGRA-PSD are research projects. They are collecting data on diseases and nutrition and build capacities of local institutions. Whether these activities can have impact on livestock

farmers will depend on the extent to which the governmental services will apply the learnt techniques and make use of the collected data. Supposing this will indeed be the case, it will only have a measurable impact on livestock farmers' incomes after the end of the Compact. The project implemented by MBN not only had been suspended due to FMD outbreak in Caprivi, it also has an important political dimension. If the proposed approach will be accepted in Namibia, and more importantly by meat importing countries, it can have measurable impact. It is doubtful, however, whether that will be the case during the lifetime of the project. The training project implemented by Komeho is the only project of the current four where measurable impact may occur. If farmers adopt (some of) the extension messages it may improve their cattle and thereby their wealth and income. Again, this will take time and measuring the increased income attributable to the intervention will be difficult.

To mitigate this risk concerning the focus on impact, the evaluation design takes a wider look at the project. It will not single out impact, but will look at impact as one of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. The characteristics of Real Time Evaluation also ensure that the evaluation findings feed back to the implementers for immediate use. In addition an assessment of whether projected impacts could be achieved after the end of the Compact, based on the program logic and what has been achieved to-date, can be made.

One risk related to Real Time Evaluation is the dependency on the stakeholders that are being evaluated. The consultant not only needs to rely on the data provided by the implementers, but also will need their assistance to engage with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders, like extension staff or local authorities.

This risk will be mitigated by establishing a good working relationships with the implementers (MCA-N, LMEF grantees, and relevant parties related to the SVOs, quarantine camps, and traceability efforts) and maintaining regular and open communication. It is expected that the implementers will be aware of the participatory and iterative nature of the evaluation process and that open and realistic exchange of information is the best way for all to collaborate in it.

## **4 Evaluation work plan**

The MCA-N Livestock Support Activity evaluation approach can be summarised as an iterative process of regular evaluation missions, following, assessing and documenting implementation progress based on document review and triangulation with field observations and interviews. It contains three main elements, after the design phase: (i) quarterly evaluation missions, (ii) the final evaluation of the LMEF grant cycles and (iii) the final comprehensive evaluation of the MCA-N Livestock Support Activity. Table 4.1 gives the proposed work plan for the evaluation. The different phases are elaborated in the following sub-sections.

The work plan deviates from the work plan in the ToR, but has been approved in the meantime by MCA-N.

### **4.1 Quarterly evaluation missions**

The largest part of the work plan consists of quarterly evaluation missions, starting in May 2012 and ending in March 2014. These quarterly missions are in line with the original ToR for the LMEF evaluation, with one adaptation. The ToR mentions eight quarterly reports for at least three LMEF grant cycles. Since the grant cycles to a large extent will be running concurrently (and are all likely to end more or less at the same time) and because other livestock sub-activities were added to the Scope of Services, it is not feasible nor practical to have separate reporting systems for the different grant cycles. The work plan therefore consists of quarterly missions and report, during which each on-going grant project, regardless of its grant cycle, and sub-activity will be evaluated.

In the course of the evaluation process the different evaluation questions as listed in Section 3.4 above will be answered. For obvious reasons, questions regarding impact (and sustainability?) can only be answered towards the end of the evaluation (and even then may reflect the evaluator's projections given results achieved to-date), while questions on relevance can be answered in an early stage. Other criteria, such as effectiveness and efficiency will gradually become more prominent as the evaluation progresses.

The evaluation progress reports are therefore growing documents, which will be enriched by each evaluation mission. It is also expected to have a learning function for the parties under evaluation. It is the intention of the evaluator to make this a participatory and shared process, where responses and opinions of the evaluated organisations are integrated in the reports.

For each quarterly mission the following common observations are made, aiming for the missions to be as effective and efficient as possible:

- emphasis will be on field observations and meetings/interviews in the grant project areas;
- to allow for effective preparation, MCA-N and/or the project implementers are requested to share progress reports and other relevant documentation with the consultant prior to the start of the field mission;
- the consultant will communicate his travel dates timely to the project implementers. The project implementers in turn are requested to indicate possibilities for field work in the indicated period of time to allow for planning of field work before the start of the mission;

- each mission will start with a short meeting at MCA-N in Windhoek and end with a debriefing;
- a draft quarterly evaluation report will be shared with MCA-N and project implementers for comments.

#### **4.2 Final evaluation of grant cycles**

The last quarterly evaluation mission is scheduled to take place when the projects have come to an end. This is provisionally scheduled for April/June 2014. This mission will lead to a final report of the evaluation. In line with the ToR the draft final report will be followed by a stakeholders workshop, a final report and production of information materials.

#### **4.3 Final comprehensive evaluation**

The last stage of the evaluation is the production of a final comprehensive report for the evaluation of the MCA-N livestock activity. In line with the ToR, the draft comprehensive evaluation report will be produced by 21 July 2014. It will be followed by a stakeholders workshop, a final report and production of information materials. All deliverables are then expected to have been produced by 1 September 2014, which will bring the evaluation to an end.

**Table 4.1** Proposed work plan for LMEF evaluation

| Dates        | Activity                                     | Deliverable                      | Due date          |
|--------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Feb/Mar 2012 | Evaluation design and planning               | Draft evaluation design report   | 5 March 2012      |
|              |  | <i>Comments by MCA-N</i>         | 13 March 2012     |
|              |  | Final evaluation design report   | 20 March 2012     |
|              |  | Information materials            | 3 April 2012      |
| May/Jun 2012 | 1 <sup>st</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 20 June 2012      |
| Aug/Sep 2012 | 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 20 September 2012 |
| Nov/Dec 2012 | 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 3 December 2012   |
| Feb/Mar 2013 | 4 <sup>th</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 20 March 2013     |
| May/Jun 2013 | 5 <sup>th</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 20 June 2013      |
| Aug/Sep 2013 | 6 <sup>th</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 20 September 2013 |
| Nov/Dec 2013 | 7 <sup>th</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 3 December 2013   |
| Feb/Mar 2014 | 8 <sup>th</sup> quarterly evaluation mission | Quarterly progress report        | 20 March 2014     |
| Apr-Jun 2014 | Final evaluation grant cycles                | Draft evaluation report          | 30 May 2014       |
|              |  | Stakeholders workshop and report | 30 June 2014      |
|              |  | Final evaluation report          | 14 July 2014      |
|              |  | Information materials            | 21 July 2014      |
| Jul-Sep 2014 | Final comprehensive evaluation               | Draft evaluation report          | 21 July 2014      |
|              |  | Stakeholders workshop and report | 11 August 2014    |
|              |  | Final evaluation report          | 25 August 2014    |
|              |  | Information materials            | 1 September 2014  |

## **Annex 1 Terms of Reference, with amendments**

### **Terms of Reference**

#### **Evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Market Efficiency Fund (LMEF), now known as the Evaluation of MCA Namibia's Livestock Support Activity**

### **1. Summary**

The objective of this Terms of Reference (TOR) is to define the terms for the evaluation of Millennium Challenge Account Namibia's Livestock Market Efficiency Fund (LMEF or "the Fund"). Using data collected by LMEF grantees, the Consultant, and other sources, the evaluation will assess how each of the grants have achieved their stated objectives, especially (where applicable) in terms of impact on the intended beneficiaries. The evaluation should also look at whether the LMEF as a whole has achieved its stated objectives, particularly in terms of its contribution to reducing costs and losses associated with marketing livestock in the Northern Communal Areas (NCAs); alleviating other challenges to successful commercial marketing of livestock that are present in the current supply chain beyond the farm gate due to the lack of disease-free status; and identifying and eliminating barriers to increasing volume of livestock and livestock products sold into existing markets and accessing additional markets destinations; and other relevant questions as determined based on the specific details of the grants.

### **2. Background Information**

#### **2.1 The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)**

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) was established in January 2004 as a United States government corporation to implement the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA). MCC's mission is to reduce poverty by supporting sustainable, transformative economic growth in developing countries, which create and maintain sound policy environments. MCC is designed to support innovative strategies and to ensure accountability for measurable results. For additional information on MCC please visit <http://www.mcc.gov>.

#### **2.2 Namibia's Millennium Challenge Compact**

The MCA Namibia (MCA-N) Compact, which provides grant funding for public investments in Education, Tourism and Agriculture, was signed on 28 July 2008 between the Republic of Namibia and the US Government, acting through the MCC. An amount of US\$304.5 million will be available for development in the target sectors, over and above current Government allocations and assistance from other development partners.

The Goal of Namibia's Millennium Challenge Compact is to reduce poverty through economic growth in the Education, Tourism and Agriculture sectors. To accomplish the Compact Goal of increasing income, the MCA-N Programme aims to achieve the following objectives:

- i) Increase the competence of the Namibian workforce (knowledge, skills and attitude);
- ii) Increase the productivity of agricultural and non-agricultural enterprises in rural areas.

The Compact aims to improve the quality of education and training for the underserved populations, and attempts to capitalize on Namibia's comparative advantages to increase the incomes of the poor Namibians, predominantly in the northern areas of the country.

In **Education**, the Programme seeks to bring the quality of the work force closer to the requirements of industry and the labour market at large. This is in line with the aspirations of Vision 2030 and the 3rd National Development Plan's strategic objective for "productive and competitive human resource and institutions", whose values informed the programming, content and activities of the Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme (ETSIP). The MCA-N Education Project contributes to ETSIP. It aims to improve the competency and knowledge of young Namibians by supporting new and innovative methods of learning in addition to the more traditional approaches to education and improve physical infrastructure for learning and teaching in schools, regional study and resource centres and Community Based Skills Development Centres.

The **Tourism** Project seeks to bring conservancies in high potential tourism areas into the mainstream of the tourism business, increasing the financial and in-kind benefits to rural conservancy members. Internationally-acknowledged best practice models for community-based tourism and community-based natural resource management underpin the Tourism Project. This is the first MCC project with an explicit focus on tourism, acknowledging the sector's tremendous poverty alleviating potential in rural areas of Namibia. The Etosha National Park will serve as a model for increased participation by the adjacent conservancies. MCA- N's Tourism Project will facilitate access to the Park for the conservancies around it through exclusive access concessions, to be awarded through the 2007 Concession Policy. The MCA-N Tourism Project will also enhance regional and international marketing of Namibia as a tourism destination.

The **Agriculture** Project comprises three main activities in livestock, land access and management and indigenous natural products. The **Livestock** Activity seeks to bring the marketing opportunities for farmers who live north of the Veterinary Cordon Fence ("the Fence") closer to the opportunities enjoyed by farmers south of the Fence. The focus will be on improving veterinary services aimed at obtaining animal disease-free status for the NCAs in order to gain access to international markets. The accompanying public investment in rangeland management will improve access to grazing and farming practices. The overall objective is to increase the farmers' cash income derived from large stock and small stock farming in the NCAs. Through the **Land Access and Management Activity** the Communal Land Boards, traditional authorities and other key stakeholders will be empowered to better manage the available resources. Increasing direct participation of the primary producers in the processes of value addition to raw, natural products such as Marula, Kalahari Melon Seed, Hoodia, Devil's Claw and Ximenia is the key objective of the **Indigenous Natural Products Activity**. The value chain approach that the INP sector has adopted will ensure that the activities are responsive to the fast-changing market realities for natural products. At present, most of the revenue from selling products made of these valuable commodities is generated outside Namibia. The MCA-N Programme will facilitate an increased participation by the primary producers in the final processing, packaging and marketing of these products.

Please visit <http://www.mcanamibia.org> for the detailed Project Descriptions. This TOR is related to the Tourism and Agriculture projects as well as to MCA-N's M&E Plan.



## 2.3 The MCA Namibia Management Structure

MCA-N is the accountable entity, responsible for the overall management of the Compact's implementation. MCA-N is a legal entity within the National Planning Commission (Office of the President) comprised of a Board and a Programme Management Unit. MCA-N's Board provides oversight and strategic guidance and is ultimately responsible for the Programme's success, while the Programme Management Unit is responsible for the implementation of the Compact, including programme management, financial management and reporting, and coordination of M&E. The Programme is legally governed by the Compact and its supplemental agreements. For additional information please visit <http://www.mcanamibia.org>.

## 2.4 Consultancy-Specific Background

The objective of the LMEF is to increase incomes to livestock producers and ensure the continued growth of the livestock sector. It is expected that this objective will be achieved through improving livestock marketing, eliminating barriers to existing and new markets and improving the marketability of livestock for broad application to the livestock industry in the NCAs to ensure the competitiveness and sustainability of the livestock sector.

Given the lack of disease-free status in the NCAs and limited market access, farmers face high costs in the formal marketing of animals. Combined with the open access grazing systems, poor market incentives lead to overstocking of rangelands and degradation of the resource base and, consequently, to poor livestock nutrition and productivity. The estimated average off-take rate in the NCAs is only 7%, compared to 25% in the regions south of the Veterinary Cordon Fence. The LMEF should therefore impact on the livestock-producing communities in the NCAs through demand-driven actions that will improve the incomes of livestock producers. This will enable the livestock producers benefiting from the Fund to overcome the constraints of a lack of flexibility and efficient market outlets, and a poorly-functioning communal land tenure system.

Specifically, this sub-activity seeks to improve livestock incomes in the NCAs by:

- Reducing costs and losses associated with marketing livestock in the NCAs;
- Alleviating other challenges to successful commercial marketing of livestock that are present in the current supply chain beyond the farm gate due to the lack of disease free status; and
- Identifying and eliminating barriers to increasing volume of livestock and livestock products sold into existing markets and accessing additional markets destinations.

The implementation of the LMEF activity is being conducted through a two-phased process.

The **first phase** involved (i) a synthesis of existing market studies where key market strategies are identified and recommendations for market improvements are provided and (ii) consultations with stakeholders within the livestock industry. This first phase resulted in the development of a Livestock Market Efficiency **Fund Manual ("the Manual")**, which provides clear guidelines on:

use of funds; eligibility; evaluation criteria; proposal format; costing/cost-sharing guidelines; environment and social assessment guidelines; deliverables; ownership of new technology if applicable; and dissemination of results for broad and effective application and adoption livestock industry stakeholders.

The **second phase** involves the implementation of proposals selected after each of a series of formal calls for concept papers (and then full proposals) from the industry for market improvement strategies. The following are practical examples of what concept papers/proposals may include:

- Research/projects addressing traditional/cultural/educational issues hampering livestock marketing in the NCAs;
- Activities leading to the achievement of disease-free status in the NCAs, thereby opening markets;
- The expansion of trade access to regional and global beef markets;
- The provision of livestock market information;
- Livestock vaccination programmes which meet consumer requirements;
- Improved rangeland nutrition, thereby addressing consumer requirements;
- The provision of improved genetic quality in bulls and rams; and
- The upgrading and/or constructing of holding pens and loading ramps at crush pens currently used by veterinarians for vaccinations, so that these sites can be used for cattle auctions.

### **3. Objective of the Evaluation and Related Research Questions**

#### **3.1 Objective**

Using data from the LMEF grantees and other sources, the evaluation will assess the impact of the LMEF on the intended beneficiaries mainly in terms of income or other quantifiable benefits. The evaluation should also look the impact of the Fund in terms of its contribution to reducing costs and losses associated with marketing livestock in the NCAs; alleviating other challenges to successful commercial marketing of livestock that are present in the current supply chain beyond the farm gate due to the lack of disease free status; and identifying and eliminating barriers to increasing volume of livestock and livestock products sold into existing markets and accessing additional markets destinations. Finally, the evaluation should look at whether the LMEF as a whole has achieved its stated objectives. (The November 2012 contract amendment expanded the objectives of the evaluation – see Section 4.1 below.)

#### **3.2 Research Questions**

- To what extent does the LMEF contribute to increased incomes as well as other measures of livelihood among beneficiaries?
- Does the LMEF contribute to disease free status for the NCAs? If so, how and to what extent?
- Does the LMEF contribute towards the identification and elimination of existing marketing barriers and other challenges to successful commercial marketing of livestock in the NCAs? If so, what is the impact (e.g., increased volume of livestock and livestock products sold into existing markets in the NCAs and in existing and new market destinations)?

- Has the application of the LMEF led to any multiplier effects in terms of replication of grantee projects, extension of project outcomes, and dissemination of information?
- To what extent has the Fund as a whole achieved its stated objectives?

Other questions, as relevant the specific details of each grant, will be added by the Consultant.

The Consultant should become familiar with the LMEF and related grant projects and propose further ideas for evaluating the Fund. It will likely be necessary for the Consultant to come up with a simple mini evaluation design for each grant, each with its unique research questions.

(See Section 4.1 for research questions added as a result of the November 2012 contract amendment that expanded the scope of the evaluation.)

## **4. Scope of Services**

### **4.1 Overview of the Scope**

The scope of this task is to design and implement an evaluation of the LMEF using the most rigorous quantitative methodology possible, supplemented with qualitative data collection and analysis.

The Consultant shall be responsible for full design and implementation of the evaluation but will need to work closely with MCA-N's Director: M&E, Director: Agriculture, Manager: M&E, Manager: Agricultural Grants, and the LMEF grantees. The approach must be approved by MCA-N before further work can proceed.

The priority research questions initially identified were provided in section 3.2; however, as noted, the Consultant shall be expected to work with relevant stakeholders to verify, refine, and focus them as necessary, to maximize the evaluation's learning potential.

The Consultant will participate in oversight of the grantees' data collection activities to ensure that they meet the needs of the evaluation, and shall be expected to provide substantial evaluation-related guidance and input to the grantees or other entities that may have existing data that contributes to the evaluation. MCA-N will facilitate this process.

A high level of collaboration with other stakeholders as well as review and involvement in implementation, data collection and data quality issues is required.

The evaluation work will be performed in three phases as follows:

**Phase 1:** Evaluation Design and Planning

**Phase 2:** Evaluation Implementation, Management and Analysis

**Phase 3:** Communication and Finalisation

### **EXPANDED SCOPE AS PER NOVEMBER 2012 CONTRACT AMENDMENT**

With reference to Section 4 – Scope of Services of Contract, it was agreed to amend Scope of Services by including the rest of the sub-activities related to the Livestock Support activity to the overall LMEF evaluation. The additional sub-activities are “Construction of 5 State Veterinary Offices (SVOs) and Rehabilitation of 2 Quarantine Camps) (Q-Camps)”, and “Livestock Traceability System”. The following text is inserted at section 4 of the contract.

The evaluation of the LMEF and related grants cannot be understood in isolation but rather only within the broader context of the livestock sector and MCA Namibia's Livestock Support Activity as a whole. Besides LMEF, the Livestock Support activity's components include:

Three new SVOs are being constructed in high volume livestock areas (Eenhana, Outapi and Omuthiya), which were identified as optimal geographic sites for veterinary offices and clinics through the Ministry of Agriculture, Water & Forestry's (MAWF) National Agricultural Support Services Program study during 2006. These offices are intended to improve the delivery of veterinary services to the NCAs which have been historically underserved. An additional two SVOs are constructed at two underserved sites south of the existing Veterinary Cordon Fence, Okakarara and Epukiro to support improved livestock production in those areas.

Because of the continued presence of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in the Caprivi, the two Quarantine Camps that provide throughput to the only operating meat processing plant located in the region are being rehabilitated to improve livestock productivity and marketing.

The Namibia Compact funds the development of a nationwide livestock traceability system (called NamLITS), which did not previously exist in the NCAs. The main aim of the traceability system is to provide livestock owners and the government with timely and quality information on livestock numbers, their location, animal health status and other key attributes associated with livestock. The system will meet market-entry and traceability requirements of livestock and livestock products throughout the entire supply chain.

In light of the above, in addition to the research questions in Section 3.2 of the contract, it is expected that the Evaluator will add the following questions to the Evaluation Design:

- To what extent, if any, has the Namibia Compact achieved stated objectives related to quarantine camp, SVO, and livestock traceability investments?
- What is the impact of the Livestock Support activity overall on:
  - Cattle health?
  - Attainment of FMD-free status?
  - Cattle marketability?
  - International market access?
  - Livestock sales?

The Evaluation Design Report (updated) will be submitted to MCA-N for review. The same report will be shared with MCC, Grantees, and other stakeholders. MCA-N will return comments to the Consultant on the Evaluation Design Report (updated) within 1 week of receiving it.

## **4.2 Tasks and Deliverables for Each Phase**

### **4.2.1 Phase 1: Evaluation Design and Planning (applicable at baseline, with updates to the Evaluation Design Report to be made at each grant round as needed)**

The Consultant shall review the LMEF Grant Manual and all relevant grant documents and available literature and data to determine the methodology needed to carry out the evaluation, including any

additional data needs aside from that which can be gathered from grantees and that which can be obtained through Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs), and prepare a full evaluation design report. MCA-N must approve the evaluation design before the Consultant can move to the next phase.

#### Specific Tasks for Phase 1

- Review MCA-N's M&E Plan and relevant programme documents and survey documents to date to become familiar with the Compact and the LMEF Grant Manual and related project documents. The consultant shall at a minimum review the following:
  - MCA-N Compact Description;
  - MCA-N Monitoring & Evaluation Plan;
  - MCA-N Agriculture Project Description;
  - MCA-N LMEF Grant Manual; and
  - approved LMEF project descriptions.
- Conduct a literature review of relevant prior evaluations and research on livestock marketing in the NCAs and prepare an annotated bibliography of the identified documents;
- Conduct initial planning, discuss scope, refine research questions, and reach agreement on the evaluation design, related methodologies, and evaluation implementation with MCA-N's Director: M&E, Director: Agriculture, Manager: M&E, Manager: Agriculture Grants, and the LMEF grantees;
- Conduct field trips to the LMEF grantees' intervention areas for familiarisation purposes, coordinated with the Fund's grantees;
- Prepare full evaluation design report, including at a minimum:
  - Detailed evaluation methodology and approach;
  - Refined research questions and proposed analytical model;
  - List of data sources expected to be used for the evaluation and any data cleaning that the Consultant expects to perform as well as a plan for addressing and monitoring data quality for data sourced from grantees;
  - Implementation plan and timeline for evaluation (i.e., a Work Plan and Staff Engagement Plan);
  - Risk assessment for evaluation, and proposed mitigation measures; and
  - Recommendations for incorporating evaluation design into the implementation plan for the LMEF grant projects.

The design report will initially focus on what is known about grants approved to date and what is expected for future grants, but it may need to be revised to account for additional grants, depending on their content.

- Meet with MCA-N management to present the proposed methodology, discuss and get feedback on the evaluation design, evaluation methodologies and evaluation implementation issues and incorporate any changes and suggestions to it;
- Prepare a set of informational materials about the evaluation and its approach, which can be used by MCA-N in presentations, discussions with stakeholders, etc., in order to communicate clearly about the evaluation.

### Key Deliverables for Phase 1

(1) Evaluation Design Report that, at a minimum, addresses the following:

- a. Detailed evaluation methodology and approach;
- b. Refined research questions and proposed analytical model;
- c. List of data sources expected to be used for the evaluation and any data cleaning that the Consultant expects to perform as well as a plan for addressing and monitoring data quality for data sourced from grantees;
- d. Implementation plan and timeline for evaluation (i.e., a Work Plan and Staff Engagement Plan);
- e. Risk assessment for evaluation, and proposed mitigation measures;
- f. Recommendations for incorporating evaluation design into the implementation plan for the LMEF grantees' projects.

As noted previously, the design report will initially focus on what is known about grants approved to date and what is expected for future grants, but it may need to be revised to account for additional grants, depending on their content.

(2) Informational materials that, at a minimum, include the following:

- a. A PowerPoint presentation explaining the basics of the evaluation, the evaluation design's advantages over other designs given the context and other key points from the evaluation design report; and
- b. A "Frequently Asked Questions" document covering key points about the evaluation approach, i.e., a document explaining the basics of the evaluation in a question-and-answer format and in language that is easily accessible to members of the general public.

### **4.2.2 Phase 2: Evaluation Implementation, Management and Analysis (applicable to the evaluation for each grant cycle<sup>4</sup>)**

---

<sup>4</sup> A grant cycle is defined as the point from which a formal Call for Concept Papers is released and the end of the two-year period for grants approved on the basis of that particular Call (or grant round). It is anticipated that there will be three (3) grant rounds (i.e., three points in time over the course of the Compact when a formal Call for Concept Papers is issued). Depending on the availability of LMEF monies, a further (i.e., fourth) Call for Concept Papers may be considered. The end of the third (and possible fourth) grant cycle is expected to more or less coincide with the end of the Compact

As noted previously, the Consultant may not begin Phase 2 until MCA-N has approved the Evaluation Design Report deliverable from Phase 1.

### Specific Tasks for Phase 2

Once the design report has been approved (again, it will initially focus on what is known about grants approved to date and what is expected for future grants, but it may need to be revised to account for additional grants, depending on their content), the Consultant may proceed with the agreed-upon work plan, which will inform the specific tasks to be completed in this phase, which should be performed in accordance with the following guidelines:

- Communicate the evaluation progress regularly according to a frequency to be agreed upon with MCA-N;
- Produce minutes of key meetings and distribute the minutes to meeting participants and to MCA-N within five (5) days after the meeting;
- Collect data (conduct KIIs and FGDs);
- Continue to participate in oversight of any other relevant data collection and related data quality measures to ensure that they meet the needs of the evaluation;
- Update the design report elements as necessary for any issues or needed adjustments based on the course of grantees' project implementation, clearly identifying and justifying any recommended changes;
- Once relevant data collection has been completed, analyse the data and other information to answer the evaluation questions; and
- Prepare and submit quarterly progress reports.

### Key Deliverables for Phase 2

(1) Updated Evaluation Design Report (if necessary);

(2) Quarterly progress reports whose content shall at a minimum include: summary of implementation activities, performance against evaluation work plan and timeline, any issues and concerns that have arisen and mitigation measures taken, any adjustments made based on the course of the implementation, clearly identifying and justifying any recommended changes; and

(3) Draft Evaluation Report that, at a minimum, addresses the following:

- a. Detailed evaluation methodology and approach;
- b. Refined research questions and analytical model used;
- c. List of data sources used for the evaluation and any data cleaning that the Consultant performed as well as how data quality was addressed and monitored;
- d. Descriptions of how the evaluation and how the LMEF activity were implemented;
- e. Findings from the evaluation;

f. Lessons learned and recommendations (especially with regard to how the positive findings might be sustained post-Compact); and

g. Conclusion.

#### **4.2.3 Phase 3: Communication and Finalisation (applicable to the evaluation at the end of each grant cycle and at end-Compact)**

The Consultant may not begin Phase 3 until MCA-N has approved the updated Evaluation Design Report and Draft Evaluation Report deliverables from Phase 2.

##### Specific Tasks for Phase 3

Specific tasks for Phase 3 would be informed by the agreed-upon work plan in the Evaluation Design Report but will include, at a minimum: planning and conducting a stakeholders' workshop to discuss the findings presented in the Draft Evaluation Report; recording stakeholders' comments and suggestions for possible incorporation into the Final Evaluation Report; updating the Draft Evaluation Report accordingly; and submitting a Final Evaluation Report.

##### Key Deliverables for Phase 3

(1) Stakeholders' workshop and related workshop report that includes, at a minimum:

- a. An executive summary that sums up the full report;
- b. Background and goals of the workshop;
- c. List of workshop participants;
- d. A synopsis of the proceedings;
- e. A summary of all feedback received from workshop participants;
- f. Primary recommendations and conclusions;
- g. A roadmap as to how the outcome of the workshop will be applied to the evaluation and/or to its deliverables.

(2) Final Evaluation Report that includes the minimum requirements laid out for the Draft Evaluation Report (see section 4.2.2);

(3) Informational materials that, at a minimum, include:

- a. A PowerPoint presentation explaining the basics of the evaluation, the evaluation design's advantages over other designs in this context, the findings of the evaluation, lessons learned and how the positive findings might be sustained post-Compact, and key conclusions drawn; and
- b. "Frequently Asked Questions" document covering the key points noted in point a. above, i.e., a document explaining the basics of the evaluation, the evaluation design's advantages over other designs in this context, the findings of the evaluation, lessons learned and how the positive findings might be sustained post-Compact, and key conclusions in a question-



and-answer format and in language that is easily accessible to members of the general public.

## **5. Duration of the Assignment**

From the time of contracting through to the end of the Compact (15 September 2014).

## **6. Evaluation Criteria: Qualifications and Experience**

A Consultant will be selected based on qualifications and proven experience to do the work. Applications are invited from individual consultants who are recognised evaluation experts who can demonstrate the ability to be responsible for the technical and methodological leadership of the evaluation. Applicants should, at a minimum, possess the following qualifications, skills and professional experience:

- A Master's degree in Agricultural Science, other relevant social sciences, or statistics.
- At least 5 years experience of designing and implementing evaluations, and having worked on quantitative as well as qualitative analysis of data.
- Preferably 5 years experience in managing or overseeing evaluation projects in agricultural settings (preference will be given to those with experience in agricultural marketing).
- Excellent communication skills and experience in working with a wide range of individuals in government, private sector and civil society.
- Good written and verbal communication skills in English.
- Excellent knowledge of SPSS or similar statistical analysis software as well as other software used in the analysis of qualitative data.